

**FPPC Task Force
Topic Area Assignments**

| <u>Topic</u> | <u>Public Member</u> | <u>FPPC Staff Member</u> |
|--|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Electronic filing | LeeAnn Pelham | Dixie Howard |
| Simplify forms and reports | Fred Keeley | Lynda Cassady |
| Deadlines | Steven Lucas | Galena West |
| Campaign finance thresholds | Darius Anderson | Trish Mayer |
| State/local consistency | Janis Hirohama | Luisa Menchaca |
| Termination requirements | Jeff Marston | Gary Winuk |
| Committee classification | Joe Rodota | Hyla Wagner |
| Robocalls | Jeannine English | Gary Winuk |
| Slate mailers | Rich Schlackman | Tina Bass |
| Expenditure reporting | Dorothy Rothrock | Luisa Menchaca |
| Conflict of interest disclosure thresholds | Michael Martello | Scott Hallabrin |
| Revolving door | Araceli Ruano | Emelyn Rodriguez |
| Other disclaimers | John Marelius | Hyla Wagner |

| <u>Topic</u> | <u>Plan of Action</u> |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Electronic filing | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consider common electronic filing threshold for state and local filings (e.g., \$25,000 in contributions or expenditures), local option to incorporate (e.g., like local option to incorporate election dates) or have an active link process (e.g., Secretary of State's link to local election officials) ▪ Work with the Secretary of State on cost options for revamping and/or updating a unified electronic filing system |
| Simplify forms and reports | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consider moving to a "data based" reporting system, look at other states that have adopted this approach, and consider feasibility of recommending such system for California campaign reporting ▪ Review whether simplification can be achieved with fewer types of reports (e.g., can schedule changes eliminate 465, 496, 497, or 495 reports?) |
| Campaign finance thresholds | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Disclosure contributor thresholds (e.g., increase from \$100 to \$200, more than \$200); alternate: require local jurisdictions to remain at \$100 ▪ Major donor threshold (e.g., increase from \$10,000 to \$20,000, \$30,000); or only require if major donor is giving to more than one candidate, ballot measure or committee ▪ Committee registration threshold (e.g., increase \$1,000 to \$2,000;); put "one bite" rule in statute with corresponding threshold adjustment ▪ Issue advocacy threshold (e.g., reduce from \$50,000 to \$25,000, \$10,000) |

| | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| | |
| State/local consistency | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Coordinate with “electronic filing” group proposal to create one statewide electronic filing location (e.g., Secretary of State) ▪ Coordinate with “committee classification” group adjustments to local vs. state principal filing location issue. ▪ Coordinate with “campaign finance thresholds” group possible two-tiered disclosure thresholds approach; should large jurisdictions’ thresholds be tied to state thresholds? (e.g., Los Angeles, Orange County, San Francisco, San Diego) ▪ Consider methods to accomplish consistency between definitional terms used in the Political Reform Act and local jurisdictions’ campaign finance disclosure and contribution limitation laws. |
| Termination requirements | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consider shorter window for terminations of older committees. ▪ Consider impact of candidates’ filing to raise money for future elections and termination issues when candidates abandon or never file Election Code candidacies for the future election. |
| Committee classification | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review with “simplification” and “deadlines” groups whether more frequent reporting would substantially eliminate the need for primarily formed and general purpose committees and special filing requirements. ▪ Review candidate controlled committee status and impact on filing requirements. |

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| Robocalls | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consider simplification or clarification of Section 84310 requirements for phone banks. ▪ Review PUC and FCC requirements as they impact political calls and existing phone bank requirements. ▪ Require scripts to be sent to the FPPC within 2 days of call. |
| Slate mailers | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consider clarification of disclaimers. ▪ Consider clarification of distinguishing placements that are paid for from those that are put on for free or reduced charge. ▪ Consider revamping of current system that requires recipient committees that produce slate listings in certain instances to file duplicate slate mailer reports. ▪ Consider applying contribution limits to slate mailer organizations' placement of candidates or measures on the slate mailer for less than fair market value or requiring disclosure if purchase of a placement by a ballot measure, e.g., provides consideration for the placement or refusal of placement of another candidate or measure determined by the purchaser. ▪ Require slate mailers to be sent to the FPPC. |
| Expenditure reporting | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consider adjustment of regular expenditure disclosure thresholds (e.g., from \$100 to \$200; more than \$200.) ▪ Consider inclusion of date of expenditure on reports and review with "reports simplification" group. ▪ Consider raising disclosure threshold for media purchases or itemization requirement for media station/outlet disclosures. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consider raising subvendor disclosure threshold for petition circulators' and Get Out the Vote (GOTV) programs' disclosure of individual circulator or GOTV workers' payments. |
| Conflict of interest disclosure thresholds | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consider McPherson I proposals to raise various conflict of interest disclosure thresholds. ▪ Consider simplification of Schedule A-2 (Form 700) reporting categories. ▪ Consider modification of statutory definitions to cover new investment assets or entities not contemplated by current law. |
| Revolving door | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review federal and other jurisdictions' approach to revolving door disqualifications. ▪ Review current one-year and lifetime disqualification standards of Political Reform Act for consistency, exceptions and exemptions. |
| Other disclaimers | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consider consolidation of disclaimer provisions of PRA in one chapter. ▪ Consider adoption of federal standards for authorized and non-authorized (i.e., independent) communication disclaimers. ▪ Review in conjunction with FPPC's internet task force recommendations. |